

## REMARKS

Minor changes are made in claim 1 to hopefully make the claim clearer.

Claim 1 calls for determining channel prediction terms for both first channel estimation terms and second channel estimation terms. The first channel estimation terms are derived from a first common pilot channel signal and the second channel estimation terms are derived from a second common pilot channel signal. The claim also calls for enabling control over future transmission patterns of the channel using the channel prediction terms.

The office action suggests that the first clause of claim 1 is shown in paragraph 77 of Hottinen. But this hardly seems possible since paragraph 77 relates to a receiver. In Figure 1 of the reference, there is a receiver 20 with one antenna that receives signals from a BS10 with two antennas. The discussion in paragraph 77 is all about receiving. There is no discussion anywhere in paragraph 77 about getting channel prediction terms from the first channel estimation terms derived from a first common pilot channel signal and second channel estimation terms derived from the second common pilot channel signal. In fact, there is no discussion whatsoever of having two common pilot channel signals. In the fifth line of paragraph 77, there is a reference to extracting "the" pilot channel signal. This suggests two pilot channel signals are not utilized. Two channel estimates are utilized, but they are basically one channel estimate and that same estimate rotated by an angle of 45 degrees. See the last sentence of paragraph 77.


Finally, there is no discussion whatsoever of enabling control over future transmission patterns in the channel. Nothing is shown in the figures and there is absolutely no discussion of such a topic in paragraph 77 or anywhere else in the reference. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claim 4 calls for adaptively calculating the channel prediction terms from first and second channel estimation terms for one or more iterations. The rejection cites paragraph 43, but there is no discussion of these calculating iterations or calculating adaptively. Thus, the reason for citing paragraph 43 is not understood. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

On a similar analysis, the other rejected claims should also now be in condition for allowance and the Examiner's action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 4, 2004



---

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100  
Houston, TX 77024  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]